

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are currently pending in the present application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jackson et al.* (US 6,052,779). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 recites "a control means ... for issuing a request to said portable client computer system via said satellite link to disable said portable client computer system" and "a network adapter ... for disabling said portable client computer system from further operations in response to said request."

On pages 2-3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed control means is disclosed by *Jackson* in col. 2, lines 3-12, col. 4, lines 28-37, 58-65, col. 5, lines 2-27, 38-42 and col. 8, lines 22-31, and that the claimed network adapter is disclosed by *Jackson* in col. 2, lines 28-37 and col. 5, lines 2-27. All the above-cited passages in *Jackson* are related to wake-on LAN and wake-up scheduling technique and not related to "issuing a request to said portable client computer system via said satellite link to disable said portable client computer system," as claimed. For example, col. 2, lines 28-37 of *Jackson* states:

The controlling system is preferably operable to automatically calculate the wake-up schedule based on a target start time and a typical boot time for each client system.

In one preferred arrangement, the controlling system is further operable to detect the successful completion of the boot process for each client and to dynamically alter the wake-up schedule for the client systems remaining to be woken up. Thus if a client completes earlier than expected then the controlling system can consider whether the wake-up schedule can be brought forward for the remaining clients.

It is clear that none of the above-cited passage is related to "a network adapter ... for disabling said portable client computer system from further operations in response to said request," as claimed. Col. 5, lines 2-27 of *Jackson* states:

Once the POST routines are complete, the system BIOS causes the client to invoke RPL code stored in ROM on the client's network adapter card. This RPL code, executing on the client system

processor causes the client to broadcast RPL requests onto the network (step 220), the RPL requests specifying at least the network address of the client, which address is burned into adapter ROM during manufacture. The RPL code additionally opens a Service Access Point (SAP) at the client through which responses are received during the boot process.

The RPL request is then received by the one or more servers (which may be the same as the server issuing the wake-up frame) executing a process which compares the network address of the client against a locally stored list of known clients. If the comparison indicates that the server is responsible, it responds (step 230) by sending a reply to the client directly using the client address specified in the RPL request. This reply specifies the network address of the responding server. The client then requests (step 240) the software image from the server which responds (step 250) by sending the software image to the client for temporary storage in volatile memory. The client then executes the software image which may be either an operating system and application software for the client's intended function, or a bootstrap program that causes the client to load its operating system from its local storage.

Similarly, it is clear that none of the above-cited passage is related to "a network adapter ... for disabling said portable client computer system from further operations in response to said request," as claimed. Because the claimed control means and network adaptor are not taught or suggested by *Jackson*, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-4 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claim 1 along with its dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng

Registration No. 43,427

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, LLP

P.O. Box 969

Austin, Texas 78767-0969

(512) 472-7800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS